REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the final office action, applicant has filed this second Request for Continued Examination, cancelled claims 41-52 to reduce the number of claims under consideration, and amended claim 53 to include the limitation of claims 54, 55 and 62 and cancelled claims 54, 55 and 62. Also new claim 63 has been added. Applicant would like to emphasize that the oil distribution channels are each in the form of an annular arc segment, and that collectively, they occupy most of a full annular area, and that the filter element is clamped in the assembly without a spring. This is vastly different from Smith. In Smith, "Unfiltered fluid inlet orifices 46 are formed at an angle to the axis of canister 10 in order to create a turbine or a swirling motion of unfiltered fluid in the unfiltered fluid compartment 48." (col. 3, lines 59-62) "The angle of each fluid inlet orifice 46 is in the same angular relationship with the axis of canister 10 as other fluid inlet orifices 46. This angled fluid inlet orifice 46 creates a swirling fluid motion inside canister 10 which is circular around filter element 10 to suspend contaminant particles in the unfiltered fluid." (col. 4, lines 4-9) Thus in Smith, the orifices are purposely made small to obtain sufficient flow velocity to create "a swirling fluid motion inside canister 10". This is directly opposite the present invention, where the inlet channels are not circular channels angled to obtain a swirling motion of the fluid, but rather are annular arc segments collectively occupying most of the full annular area. The orifices of Smith do NOT occupy most of the annular area, as is obvious from Fig. 4 of Smith. Also channels in the form of an annular arc segments clearly offer much larger flow area and far less restriction than circular orifices. Further, not only does Smith use a spring to hold the filter element in place, but Smith further has no provision for a bypass valve as specifically claimed in claims 60 and new claim 63. Instead, "Pressure switch 126 further comprises electrical contacts 132 and 133 which are aligned with each other but biased apart by spring 134." (col. 6, lines 61-63) "Pressure switch may be used to warn of over pressure situation by measures such as audible alarm or input to control system (not shown)." (col. 7, lines 10-12) Consequently it is respectfully submitted that Smith is a teaching away from the invention of claim 53, and accordingly that claim is not obvious from Smith in view of Hultgren. The claims dependent thereon are also believed allowable as providing greater specificity and novelty to the claimed combination.

New claim 63 combines the limitations of claim 53 and numerous dependent claims in a single independent claim. It is believed that claim 63 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 53, and for the further reason that while individual aspects may be found in the prior art, an unreasonable number of prior art references need to be combined to find all additional aspects when there is no suggestion for such combinations.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 06/09/2008

By _____
Roger W. Blakely, Jr.
Reg. No. 25,831
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

☐ *deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.*

Date: 06/09/2008

FACSIMILE

☒ *transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.*

Jessica A. Clark 6/9/2008
Jessica A. Clark *Date*